

To: Gray, David[gray.david@epa.gov]; Gentile, Laura[Gentile.Laura@epa.gov]
From: Selia, Emily
Sent: Mon 8/24/2015 7:38:03 PM
Subject: Re: Draft responses to WSJ

Clarification- by "us" I mean me and Christie.

From: Selia, Emily on behalf of EOC Public Information
Sent: Monday, August 24, 2015 3:36 PM
To: Gray, David; Gentile, Laura
Subject: Re: Draft responses to WSJ

Hi David,

Laura's working on some other items. Need us to draft a general response to Question 10, along with working on 11 and 12?

Thanks,

Emily

From: Selia, Emily on behalf of EOC Public Information
Sent: Monday, August 24, 2015 3:00 PM
To: Gray, David; Gentile, Laura
Cc: EOC Public Information
Subject: Re: Draft responses to WSJ

Hi David and Laura,

Some of questions required a FOIA request, per emails last week. Robert Daguillard told the reporter (Weds Aug 19) that questions 1, 6, 7, and 8 require a FOIA request. NOTE: The reporter then followed up with two additional questions. These have not been fully drafted (I will start working those drafts/approvals separately). Per Laura's indication, the first ten should be dealt with first and responded to ASAP.

Attached is a clean DRAFT document summing up the twelve questions (original ten with draft responses copied from below, plus the two follow-up questions that relate to

the first ten). There are still things to be addressed under questions 4 and 10.

Thanks,

Emily

From: "Gentile, Laura" <Gentile.Laura@epa.gov>
Date: August 24, 2015 at 1:38:45 PM EDT
To: "Gray, David" <gray.david@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Draft responses to WSJ

Yep, sorry, forgot to mention -- we are still looking for Q 1 -- should be sending up soon

R8 stripped out the question before sending the inquiry to us

Sent from my iPhone

On Aug 24, 2015, at 1:36 PM, Gray, David <gray.david@epa.gov> wrote:

I only have this and it states you are working on Q1 still.

From: Gentile, Laura **On Behalf Of** EOC Public Information
Sent: Monday, August 24, 2015 8:45 AM
To: Grantham, Nancy; Gray, David
Cc: EOC Public Information
Subject: Draft responses to WSJ

Here's what I have so far - - still looking for Question #1 (not coming up in any of my documents) and have asked OW desk to help respond to last one.

As this is already a week old, thought it would be best to share with you what we have so far.

DRAFT Responses to WSJ Questions
Revised August 22, 2015

2) How much money would an Animas River Basin cleanup have cost (ie if the site had been designated a Superfund site) and how long would it have taken? Who would have provided that funding? What specifically was to be cleaned up?

Deliberative Process/Ex. 5

3) When did the EPA first become involved there in trying to get it on the Superfund Priorities List and why? Why wasn't it put on the list?

Deliberative Process/Ex. 5

4) Why was the EPA doing the most recent work on shoring up the mines - was there something in particular that precipitated that?

Deliberative Process/Ex. 5

5) Does the EPA think at this point that this should be a Superfund site, and again how much would that cost and how would it be funded?

Deliberative Process/Ex. 5

9) How much money from the Standard Metals settlement did the EPA

collect from Standard Metals and/or its insurance fund and how much of that went to Animas River Basin cleanup. What cleanup were those funds used for?

Deliberative Process/Ex. 5

10) According to the September 2014 meeting of the Animas River Stakeholders group, EPA contractors tried to open the Gold King around that time but it collapsed back further than anticipated and there was a blockage near the entrance and a previously unidentified small mine pool that needed to be drained, so the EPA stopped work and decided to reevaluate its approach. Can you please explain this problem and how the EPA tried to solve it when going back into the mine recently.

[We understand that Steve Way is the only person who can completely and accurately respond to this question.]